



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/626,566	07/25/2003	Kenji Nakatogawa	116679	9334
25944	7590	08/19/2004	EXAMINER	
OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC P.O. BOX 19928 ALEXANDRIA, VA 22320			BEATTY, ROBERT B	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2852	

DATE MAILED: 08/19/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/626,566

Applicant(s)

NAKATOGAWA ET AL.

Examiner

Robert Beatty

Art Unit

2852

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 July 2003.
2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☒ Claim(s) 16 and 17 is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3-5,7-10 and 12-14 is/are rejected.
7) ☒ Claim(s) 2,6,11 and 15 is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

1. The drawings are objected to because the hatching for the fluorocarbon layer should be shown in Fig. 1. Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. The replacement sheet(s) should be labeled "Replacement Sheet" in the page header (as per 37 CFR 1.84(c)) so as not to obstruct any portion of the drawing figures. If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

2. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: on page 10, line 9, "12" should be changed to --21-- as shown in Fig.1.

Appropriate correction is required.

3. Claim 9 is objected to because of the following informalities: a filler having a "layered" structure is not understood. Appropriate correction is required.

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

4. Claims 1,3,5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Saito et al.

Saito et al. teach a sliding layer 17" made of a non-porous polytetrafluoroethylene (PTFE) resin is formed on a porous Flouropore layer 11 having pores (depressions). See col.6,line 44 - col.7, line 19.

5. Claims 1,3,5,7,9-10,13-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by Chen et al.

Chen et al. teach a surface layer 28 made of a non-porous polytetrafluoroethylene (PTFE) resin having a lubricative filler (col.11, lines 14-23), a conductive filler (col.12, lines 8-34) and a reactive filler (col.11, lines 41-50) having a concentration of between 1-20 parts per weight per hundred parts fluorocarbon. The word "sliding" to describe the layer is interpreted as functional language and the layer described in Chen et al. is capable of sliding.

6. Claims 1,5,12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Traut.

Traut teach a layer made of a non-porous polytetrafluoroethylene (PTFE) resin having a microfiber filler (see claim 1 of Traut).

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 1,4,8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Saito et al. or Chen et al.

Specifically, Saito et al. or Chen et al. teach a non-porous PTFE layer except the non-porous layer being formed by irradiating a fluorocarbon resin with ionizing radiation. However, the examiner notes that this claim is a product by process claim and it is the structure which is given patentable weight not the method by which it is formed. See MPEP 2113.

8. Claims 2,6,11,15 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

9. Claims 16-17 are allowable over the prior art of record.

10. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Trice et al., Suzuki et al., and Kato (JP) teach various non-porous layers.

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Robert Beatty whose telephone number is (571) 272-2130. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F from 9 to 6.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Arthur Grimley, can be reached on (571) 272-2136.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-1782.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Robert Beatty', with a long, sweeping horizontal line extending to the right.

Robert Beatty
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2852

August 18, 2004